

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1, 2 and 4-15 are now present in the application. Claims 1, 4 and 6 have been amended. Claims 1, 6 and 11 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4-11, 14 and 15 stand rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hiyama, U.S. Patent No. 7,084,850, in view of Allen, U.S. Patent No. 5,430,480. Claims 12 and 13 stand rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hiyama in view of Allen, and further in view of Kawahara, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0028347. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites a combination of elements including "an image generation means for generating a still image and its duplication but with adjustable motion vectors, and then for providing an interested display to show the above-mentioned two images at the same time, wherein the still image can present the gray level capability of the display while showing still images; and an examination means for determine the effective number of gray levels of the display while showing motion images from the above-mentioned motion image; wherein the motion image is the duplication of the still image but with adjustable moving speed and direction."

Independent claim 6 recites a combination of elements including "a visual simulator for simulating visual detection and recognition; and an image generation means for generating a still

image and its duplication but with adjustable motion vectors, and then for providing an interested display to show the above-mentioned two images at the same time, wherein the still image can present the gray level capability of the display while showing still images; and an examination means for determine the gray level capability of the display while showing motion images from the above-mentioned motion image which is a duplication of the still image.”

Independent claim 11 recites a combination of steps including “generating a still image and its duplication but with adjustable moving speed and direction, the duplication is referred as a motion image hereinafter, by an image generating means first, and then showing the images on the screen; adjusting the moving speed and direction of the moving image; and determining the discrimination of adjacent gray levels of the moving image.”

Applicant respectfully submits that the above combinations of elements and steps as set forth in independent claims 1, 6 and 11 are not disclosed nor suggested by the references relied on by the Examiner.

The Examiner has correctly acknowledged that Hiyama fails to teach that the motion image is the duplication of the still image but with adjustable moving speed and direction as recited in claims 1, 6 and 11.

However, the Examiner turned to rely on Allen and alleged that Allen in col. 1, lines 39-50 cures the deficiencies of Hiyama. Applicant respectfully disagrees. In particular, Allen in col. 1, lines 39-50 discloses:

Another use for apparent motion information is in image compression, since the amount of data needed to represent a slowly moving or steadily recorded scene is less than the amount needed for a fast moving scene. For example, a static scene of many frames can be compressed by merely eliminating all but one frame. The recording can be decompressed by copying the one remaining frame to reconstruct all the eliminated frames since they are all

identical. In a moving scene, where the recording comprises frames which are different from one another, compression is more difficult, however not impossible. (Emphasis added.)

In other words, although a static scene of Allen can be reconstructed in several frames by reproducing the same static scene in those frames, this static scene is a still image with no moving speed or direction because those frames are identical without movement. Therefore, Allen fails to teach that the motion image is the duplication of the still image but with adjustable moving speed and direction as recited in claims 1, 6 and 11.

In addition, although Allen in col. 1, lines 47-50 mentioned the motion scene, it simply states “[i]n a moving scene, where the recording comprises frames which are different from one another, compression is more difficult, however not impossible”, Allen nowhere discloses that the motion scene is the duplication of a static scene with adjustable moving speed and direction. Therefore, Allen in col. 1, lines 47-50 still fails to teach that the motion image is the duplication of the still image but with adjustable moving speed and direction as recited in claims 1, 6 and 11.

Furthermore, although Allen in col. 1, lines 47-50 mentioned duplicate data, Allen simply describes this duplicate data in the context of data compression, which is not a duplication of a still image with adjustable moving speed and direction. Therefore, the duplicate data disclosed in col. 1, lines 47-50 of Allen also fails to teach that the motion image is the duplication of the still image but with adjustable moving speed and direction as recited in claims 1, 6 and 11.

With regard to the Examiner’s reliance on Kawahara, this reference has only been relied on for its teachings related to some dependent claims. This reference also fails to disclose the above combinations of elements and steps as set forth in independent claims 1, 6 and 11. Accordingly, this reference fails to cure the deficiencies of Hiyama and Allen.

Accordingly, none of the references utilized by the Examiner individually or in combination teach or suggest the limitations of independent claims 1, 6 and 11 or their dependent claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 6 and 11 and their dependent claims clearly define over the teachings of the references relied on by the Examiner.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant respectfully petitions for a three (3) month extension of time for filing a response in connection with the present application.

Application No. 10/673,200
Amendment dated November 21, 2008
Reply to Office Action of May 22, 2008

Docket No.: 0941-1876PUS1

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: November 21, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By  #61007

 Paul C. Lewis

Registration No.: 43,368

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant